

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
9
10
11

12 Dante Shon Gordon,)
13 Plaintiff,) No. CIV 11-8153-PHX-RCB(JFM)
14 vs.) O R D E R
15 Charles L. Ryan, et al.)
16 Defendants.)
17

18 Presently before the court is a Report and Recommendation
19 ("R & R") filed with this court by the Honorable James F.
20 Metcalf, United States Magistrate Judge), wherein he makes
21 four recommendations with respect to plaintiff's First
22 Amended Complaint ("FAC"). First, pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
23 § 1915(e), he recommends dismissal of the State of Arizona as
24 a defendant, as well as dismissal of plaintiff's claims based
25 upon the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the United
26 States Constitution. R & R (Doc. 16) at 7:13-15. Second,
27 the Magistrate Judge recommends staying service of
28 plaintiff's original complaint. Id. at 7:16-17. Third, the
Magistrate Judge recommends "that Defendant Director Ryan be

1 ordered to respond to Count I of the [FAC], and that
 2 Defendants Deputy Warden Polland and Complex Administrator
 3 Elliott be ordered to respond to Count II of the [FAC].” Id.
 4 at 7:18-21. Fourth, he recommends “that service on
 5 Defendants Director Ryan, Deputy Warden Polland, and Complex
 6 Administrator Elliott proceed” as detailed in that R & R.
 7 See id. at 7:22-9:3.

8 On May 23, 2012, this R & R was filed and served upon the
 9 parties. The R & R explicitly advised the parties that,
 10 pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 72, they “shall have fourteen (14)
 11 days from the date of service of a copy of this
 12 recommendation within which to file specific written
 13 objections with the Court.” Id. at 9:9-11. None of the
 14 parties have filed objections to that R & R, and the fourteen
 15 day time frame for so doing has passed.¹


16 When reviewing an R & R issued by a Magistrate Judge,
 17 this court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in
 18 part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate
 19 judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). “Of course, de novo review of
 20 a R & R is only required when an objection is made to the
 21 R & R[.]” Wang v. Masaitis, 416 F.3d 992, 1000 n. 13 (9th
 22 Cir. 2005) (citing United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d
 23 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en banc*)). That is because
 24 “[n]either the Constitution nor the [Federal Magistrates Act]
 25 requires a district judge to review, de novo, findings and

27 ¹ Calculating the time in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 6, including
 28 allowing three extra days for service in accordance with subsection (d) of
 that Rule, means that the parties had until June 11, 2012 by which to
 timely file any objections.

1 recommendations that the parties themselves accept as
2 correct." Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d at 1121 (citations omitted).
3 Indeed, construing the Federal Magistrates Act, the Supreme
4 Court has found that that "statute does not on its face
5 require any review at all, by either the district court or
6 the court of appeals, of any issue that is not the subject of
7 an objection." Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149, 106 S.Ct.
8 466, 88 L.Ed.2d 435 (1985) (emphasis added).

9 Consistent with the foregoing authority, and no
10 objections having been filed by any party thereto, the court
11 has not engaged in a de novo review; and instead, the court
12 having "satisf[ied] itself that there is no clear error on
13 the face of the record[,] " hereby ACCEPTS, ADOPTS AND
14 INCORPORATES BY REFERENCE in its entirety, as if fully set
15 forth herein, the Magistrate Judge's Report and
16 Recommendation (Doc. 16). See FED.R.CIV.P. 72, Advisory
17 Committee Notes, 1983 Addition.

18 DATED this 2nd day of July, 2012.

19
20 
21 Robert C. Broomfield
22 Senior United States District Judge
23
24
25

26 Copies to counsel of record and plaintiff *pro se*
27
28